UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,027	10/27/2003	Claire Hartmann-Thompson	MIC35 P-333	3883
PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON, LLP 695 KENMOOR, S.E.			EXAMINER	
			SIEFKE, SAMUEL P	
P O BOX 2567 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/694,027	HARTMANN-THOMPSON, CLAIRE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SAM P. SIEFKE	1797				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	<b>J.</b> nely filed the mailing date of this or D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	'_ '					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits i						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-10</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	ГО-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		d in this National	Stage			
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Art Unit: 1797

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 2-4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Munoz et al. (USPN 7,501,091).

Munoz teaches a sensor containing a layer of conductive modified particles which forms an electrical pathway or electrical circuit between two electrodes which are connected to an electrical measuring apparatus. The layer further includes non-conductive particles such as polysilanes, polysiloxanes and polycarbosilazenes (col. 4, lines 45-65; col. 3, line 67-col.4, line 5) The modified particles are conductive and more preferably are pigment particles such as modified carbon black, wherein the modified particles have attached at least one organic group (reactive functional group) (abstract, col. 5, lines 19-50). The functional group interacts with an analyte to deliver a specific sensor characteristic. Alkyl groups and aromatic function groups including aryl groups which include phenyl, napthyl etc can be employed (col. 7, lines 22-30). Munoz teaches

Art Unit: 1797

fluorinated ligands which can be attaced to the particle such as carbon black by various methods which include covalent bonding (col. 9, lines 12-18).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1797

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munoz (USPN 7,501,091) in view of Zheng, X-ray chracterizations of Polyethylene Polyhedral Oligomeric Sisesquioxane copolymers (2001).

Munoz teaches a sensor containing a layer of conductive modified particles which forms an electrical pathway or electrical circuit between two electrodes which are connected to an electrical measuring apparatus as seen above.

Munoz does not teach polyhedral oligomeric silsesquioxane as the functional group.

Zheng teaches the use of polyhedral oligomeric silsequioxane (POSS) nanoparticles polymerized with copolymers (polymer matrix, polysiloxane) to create new stable polymer. It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invetion to modify Munoz to employ a POSS fuctional group on the carbon black to provided for a more stable polymeric matrix.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/694,027 Page 5

Art Unit: 1797

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAM P. SIEFKE whose telephone number is (571)272-1262. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Samuel P Siefke/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797